

Monitoring

Coos Bay District Implementation Monitoring

Implementation monitoring conducted on the District was based on a process developed by the District core team utilizing the questions contained in Appendix L of the Coos Bay District RMP/ROD. Questions were separated into two lists, those which were project related and those which were more general and appropriately reported in the Annual Program Summary, such as accomplishment reports. (A copy of both lists are included in Appendix C.) The monitoring team in FY 2000 consisted of a District core team member. The core team selected projects for monitoring and prepared individual reports based on the results of the office and/or field evaluation.

The following process was used for selecting individual projects to meet the ROD implementation monitoring standards:

- The core team developed a list of projects occurring in FY 2000 based on the following stratification:
 - All advertised timber sales.
 - All silvicultural projects, with each bid item considered to be a project.
 - All Jobs-in-the-Woods projects with costs exceeding \$10,000.
 - Right-of-Way projects.
 - Miscellaneous projects.
- Each of the listed projects were stratified by land use allocation and other screening factors included in the District monitoring plan.
- A random number was selected, with every fifth project from the list selected to be monitored (the Monitoring Plan in the ROD required 20 percent of projects within each area be monitored). The only advertised timber sale in FY 2000 was added to meet the 20 percent requirement. Table 29 displays the distribution of projects available for selection and those selected for monitoring by Resource Area.
- The NEPA documents and watershed analysis files for each of the selected projects were reviewed and compared to answer the first part of the implementation monitoring question: “were the projects prepared in accord with the underlying ROD requirements, NEPA and/or watershed analysis documentation? Did the contracts include what the other documents said should be included?” For each project, the 66 project specific questions included as attachments to this report were answered.

Based on this initial review, we concluded that the first portion of implementation monitoring (did we do what we said we’d do) has been satisfactorily accomplished for the projects listed below, with one exception as noted. Watershed analysis and NEPA documentation is adequate, and the

requirements contained in these documents have been included in the authorization documents.

- FY 2000 Projects in full compliance:
 - Project 2000-2 Myrtlewood Tree Planting Item 2
 - Project 2000-7 Umpqua Tree Planting Item 7
 - Project 2000-17 Fish Passage Lower Alder (JITW)
 - Project 2000-22 Umpqua Precommercial Thinning Item 1
 - Project 2000-27 Myrtlewood Manual Maintenance Item 2
 - Project 2000-32 East Fork Coquille Road Decommissioning #2 (JITW)
 - Project 2000-37 Menasha Corp. R/W 27-9- Section 6
 - Project 2000-42 Roseburg Lumber R/W 21-8-Section 27
 - Project 2000-47 The Timber Company R/W 30-10-Section 3
 - Project 2000-48 Progeny Sites Commercial Thinning Timber Sale 00-31

- FY 2000 Projects in substantial compliance:
 - Project 2000-12 Umpqua Manual Maintenance Item 1
 - One area of non-compliance was noted, the contract did not include stipulations for equipment cleaning to mitigate the spread of the Port-Orford cedar root rot. The remainder of the project is considered to be in full compliance with both the Northwest Forest Plan (NFP) and RMP ROD.

- Completed projects were reviewed in the field to answer the second part of the implementation monitoring question: “did we do on the ground what we said we would in the contract?” Based on the field reviews, we have concluded that all of the second portion of implementation monitoring requirements been satisfactorily accomplished, with one exception as noted below.

- FY 2000 Projects in full compliance:
 - Project 2000-2 Myrtlewood Tree Planting Item 2
 - Project 2000-7 Umpqua Tree Planting Item 7
 - Project 2000-17 Fish Passage Lower Alder (JITW)
 - Project 2000-22 Umpqua Precommercial Thinning Item 1
 - Project 2000-27 Myrtlewood Manual Maintenance Item 2
 - Project 2000-32 East Fork Coquille Road Decommissioning #2 (JITW)
 - Project 2000-47 The Timber Company R/W 30-10-Section 3

FY 2000 Projects in substantial compliance:

- Project 2000-12 Umpqua Manual Maintenance Item 1
 - The area of non-compliance noted that for the portion of the contract within the range of Port-Orford cedar the contract did not include stipulations for equipment cleaning to mitigate the spread of the Port-Orford cedar root rot. Casual observations during the field review did not result in observing any Port-Orford cedar within any of the

units visited, therefore the stipulation may not have been necessary. The remainder of the project is considered to be in full compliance with both the NFP and RMP ROD.

- The core team also revisited four projects in the field that had not been completed from FY 99, two projects not completed from FY 98, and one project from FY 97 to answer the second part of the implementation monitoring question. Based on the field reviews, we have concluded that the second portion of implementation monitoring requirements have been satisfactorily accomplished as indicated below:
- Projects in full compliance:
 - Project 99-4 South Fork Skyline Timber Sale 99-30
 - Project 99-41 Vincent Creek Recreation Site Reconstruction
 - Project 99-46 Baker Creek Reroute and Decommissioning
 - Project 98-3 Woodward 1-11 Commercial Thinning Timber Sale 98-03
 - Project 98-31
 - Project 97-2 Progeny Test Site Timber Sale 97-05
- Projects in substantial compliance:
 - Project 99-51 Burnt Creek Road Repair
 - One area of non-compliance was noted, the contract did not include stipulations for equipment cleaning to mitigate the spread of the Port-Orford cedar root rot. The remainder of the project is considered to be in full compliance with both the Northwest Forest Plan (NFP) and RMP ROD.
- In FY 2001 we plan on revisiting the projects where field operations were not completed, and also monitor additional projects awarded in FY 2001.

Documentation for each of the 18 projects monitored in FY 2000 is available at the District Office.

Findings and Recommendations

The results of our sixth year of monitoring evaluation continues to support earlier observations that, overall, the District is doing a good job of implementing the NFP and the Coos Bay District RMP. Attitudes are generally positive despite the dramatic change in management direction in 1994 under the NFP with its non-traditional techniques which have not been fully verified, or in some cases, even well defined. In general, the IDT approach to management appears to be working well and the District has planned and executed many ecologically sound management and restoration projects.

We continue to be impressed with the design and construction of many of the aquatic organism passage facilities (formerly called fish culverts). Many have employed unique designs and construction techniques to meet the objectives of allowing passage of a variety of aquatic organisms (fish, amphibians, invertebrates) that haven't always been considered with past

structures. Although some of the specific designs need further testing to insure that they are meeting the objectives of passing fish, salamanders and invertebrates, they appear to have been conceived from some innovative thinking and continue to be installed using sound construction techniques.

Some of the projects designed to improve aquatic habitat have also been positive. We are particularly encouraged with the attempts to increase the amount of large woody debris in streams where there is a deficit. The tree lining projects have been particularly positive in their planning, innovation, and execution. This year's random selection of the Alder Creek culvert project indicated that multiple aquatic habitat improvement projects are being implemented within the same area and in combination should greatly improve habitat for a number of species. Replacement of a culvert that restricted upstream movement by aquatic organisms in combination with placement of additional structure in Alder creek, and planting of western red cedar in the riparian area should benefit a wide variety of species over time.

We were also impressed with the continual evolution of employing new techniques for reducing potential environmental impacts or improving wildlife and fisheries habitat. Examples noted this year included: the use of feller-buncher and forwarder type equipment for harvesting small diameter timber as noted on the Progeny Test Site timber sale; the use of fibre mats for erosion control on the Burnt Creek Road repair project; the minimal ground disturbance and seeding and mulching of disturbed ground involved in the road decommissioning project. We feel that had we looked at additional projects the number of examples would still be larger.

Although we had a small sample of nearly completed timber sales to review this year, we continue to be impressed with the efforts of contract administrators and contractors to protect existing snags and coarse woody debris, green retention trees, and to retain sufficient coarse woody material.

Despite the many successes there are several areas where, based upon our monitoring this past year and in some cases previous years, we feel we can do a better job.

Finding: One silvicultural contracts did not contain provisions for compliance with the *Port-Orford Cedar Management Guidelines*. Several contracts required equipment washing and seasonal restrictions for the control of weeds; they neglected to acknowledge these measures are also used to restrict the spread of the Port-Orford cedar (POC) root rot disease. This is an improvement from previous years, where several contracts failed to include this provision.

Recommendation: The District POC coordinator should continue to insure that silviculturists, engineers, and IDT leads review the *Port-Orford Cedar Management Guidelines* and Information Bulletin No. OR-95-257 and the process is clear to insure that POC stipulations are incorporated into all appropriate contracts.

Finding: District compliance with the ROD Standards and Guidelines is good. However, there are instances where we know appropriate analysis was conducted by IDTs but that it

was not always adequately documented in the record and it is difficult to track the justification for the statement “...this action is in compliance with the NFP and the District RMP” contained in the ROD.

Recommendation: We recommend that IDT leads insure that adequate documentation is present to justify the “in compliance with” statement included in the ROD.

Type of Project	Number in Selection Pool	Number Selected in Myrtlewood R.A.	Number Selected in Umpqua R.A.
Advertised Timber Sales	1	1	0
Regeneration Harvest ¹	0	0	0
Thinning/Density Management ¹	1	1	0
Salvage Sales	0	0	0
Silvicultural Projects	25	2	3
Jobs-in-the-Woods	10	1	1
ERFO Projects	0	0	0
Right-of-Way Projects	11	1	2
Recreation Projects	0	0	0
Other	1	0	0
Within or adjacent to Riparian Reserves ²	24	2	3
Within Key Watersheds ²	17	1	3
Within Late-Successional Reserves ²	23	1	5
Adjacent to ACEC	0	0	0
Within VRM Class II or III areas	0	0	0
Within Rural Interface Area	0	0	0
Involve Burning ¹	1	1	0
Total Projects Available/Selected ³	48/11	28/5	20/6

¹ Included in the Timber Sales listed above. Two timber sale included both Regeneration Harvest and Thinning/Density Management.

² Projects selected were included in Timber sales, Silvicultural, Jobs-in-the-Woods, Right-of-Way, or other projects listed above.

³ The number of projects available for selection and selected are not additive, as many occurred within Timber sales, Silvicultural, Jobs-in-the-Woods, Right-of-Way, or other projects.

Province Level Implementation Monitoring

Within the range of the northern spotted owl, implementation monitoring results for the 24 timber sales monitored in FY 99 were encouraging and reflected good field efforts at implementing the NFP. Monitoring results indicated a 98 percent compliance with the Standards and Guidelines for timber sales. Specific results for all timber sale projects monitored in FY 99 are available in the report, “*1999 Northwest Forest Plan Implementation Monitoring Results, Part 1, Timber Sales*”. Implementation Monitoring Reports for 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999 are now on the internet (www.fs.fed.us/r6/plan/monitor).

In addition, in FY 99 one watershed level assessment was selected, and completed from one of the randomly selected timber sale mentioned above. A set of 38 questions was developed to monitor projects at the landscape level. For the province six timber sales and one landscape level project were randomly selected to be monitored. It is anticipated that Part 2, Watershed Level Assessment Results for FY 99 report should be available from the Regional Ecosystem Office (REO) in the spring of 2001.

As a result of the continued high compliance with the Standards and Guidelines for timber sales, it was decided that implementation monitoring in FY 2000 would focus on compliance with the implementation of the monitoring processes at the watershed level, rather than on additional monitoring of timber sales. Within each Province covered under the Northwest Forest Plan two 5th field watersheds were randomly selected to be monitored. In Southwestern Oregon the projects were the Trail Creek Watershed located on the BLM’s Medford District, and the Indigo Creek Watershed located on the Galice and Gold Beach Ranger Districts of the Siskiyou National Forest. Results of the FY 2000 monitoring are anticipated to be available in the summer of 2001.

Effectiveness Monitoring

Effectiveness monitoring is a longer range program than implementation monitoring, and time must pass to measure many of the factors of concern. The District continues to work with the state Research and Monitoring Committee and the REO in the development of the components for effectiveness monitoring. The following components were completed in FY 99:

- Late-Successional and Old-growth Forest Effectiveness Monitoring Plan for the Northwest Forest Plan
- Marbled Murrelet Effectiveness Monitoring Plan for the Northwest Forest Plan
- Northern Spotted Owl Effectiveness Monitoring Plan for the Northwest Forest Plan

The final strategy for the Riparian and Aquatic Resources component is anticipated to be finalized in FY 2001.

During FY 2000 some initial “on the ground” effectiveness monitoring studies were conducted for each of the components listed above. As indicated, effectiveness monitoring is a long range

program, and will require several years before results are available.

Resource Management Plan Maintenance

The *Coos Bay District Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (RMP/ROD)* was approved in May 1995. Since then, the District has begun implementing the plan across the entire spectrum of resources and land use allocations. As the plan is implemented, it sometimes becomes necessary to make minor changes, refinements, or clarifications of the plan. These actions are called plan maintenance. They do not result in expansion of the scope of resource uses or restrictions or changes in terms, conditions and decisions of the approved RMP/ROD. Plan maintenance does not require environmental analysis, formal public involvement or interagency coordination.

The following minor changes, refinements, or clarifications have been implemented as a part of plan maintenance for the Coos Bay District. To the extent necessary, the following items have been coordinated with the REO. These are condensed descriptions of the plan maintenance items, and include the major maintenance items previously reported in the 1996, 1997, and 1998 APS. Detailed descriptions are available at the Coos Bay District Office by contacting Bob Gunther.

FY 96 to FY 99 Plan Maintenance Items

Refinement of Management Actions/Direction relating to Riparian Reserves.

The term “site-potential tree” height for Riparian Reserve widths has been defined as “the average maximum height of the tallest dominant trees (200 years or older) for a given site class”. (See Northwest Forest Plan Record of Decision (NFP ROD) page C-31, RMP/ROD page 12). This definition will be used throughout the RMP/ROD.

The method used for determining the height of a “site-potential tree” is described in Instruction Memorandum OR-95-075, as reviewed by the REO. The following steps will be used:

- Determine the naturally adapted tree species which is capable of achieving the greatest height within the fifth field watershed and/or stream reach in question.
- Determine the height and age of dominant trees through on-site measurements or from inventory data.
- Average the site index information across the watershed using inventory plots, or well-distributed site index data, or riparian specific data where index values have large variations.
- Select the appropriate site index curve.
- Use Table 1 (included in Instruction Memo OR-95-075) to determine the maximum tree height potential which equates to one site potential tree for prescribing Riparian Reserve widths.

Additional details concerning site-potential tree height determinations is contained in the above

referenced memorandum. The site potential tree heights for the Coos Bay District are generally in the range of 180 to 220 feet.

Refinement of Management Actions/Direction relating to Riparian Reserves.

Both the RMP/ROD (page 12) and the NFP ROD (page B-13) contain the statement “Although Riparian Reserve boundaries on permanently-flowing streams may be adjusted, they are considered to be the approximate widths necessary for attaining Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives.” The REO and Research and Monitoring Committee agreed that a reasonable standard of accuracy for “approximate widths” for measuring Riparian Reserve widths in the field for management activities is plus or minus 20 feet or plus or minus 10 percent of the calculated width.

Minor Refinement of Management Actions/Direction relating to coarse woody debris retention in the Matrix.

The RMP/ROD describes the retention requirements for coarse woody debris (CWD) as follows: “A minimum of 120 linear feet of logs per acre, averaged over the cutting area and reflecting the species mix of the unit, will be retained in the cutting area. All logs shall have bark intact, be at least 16 inches in diameter at the large end, and be at least 16 feet in length...” (RMP/ROD pages 22, 28, 58).

Instruction Memorandum No. OR-95-028, Change 1 recognized “that in many cases there will be large diameter decay class 1 and 2 logs resulting from breakage during logging left on the unit. These log sections possess desirable CWD characteristics, but under the above standards and guidelines do not count because they are less than 16 feet long. Based on field examination of these large diameter, shorter length logs, it seems prudent to recognize that these tree sections have a significant presence on the landscape and are likely to provide the desired CWD form and function despite the fact their length is shorter than the specified minimum. As such, districts may count decay class 1 and 2 tree sections equal to or greater than 30 inches in diameter on the large end that are between 6 and 16 feet in length toward the 120 linear feet requirement.”

Refinement of Management Actions/Direction relating to Special Status Species Protection Buffers.

The RMP/ROD (page 34, Appendix C-9) and NFP ROD (page C-27) included *Buxbaumia piperi* as a protection buffer species. Instruction Memorandum OR-96-108 indicated that inclusion of *Buxbaumia piperi* as a protection buffer species was in error, and documents the decision to remove it from Protection Buffer species status.

Correction of Survey Strategies for Special Attention Species.

Table C-1 in Appendix C of the RMP/ROD (page C-10) indicated that *Arceuthobium tsugense* was to be managed under survey strategies 1 (manage known sites) and 2 (survey prior to

activities and manage sites). Information Bulletin OR-95-443 indicated that the REO determined mountain hemlock dwarf mistletoe to be common and well distributed in Oregon, and recommended that *Arceuthobium tsugense* subsp. *mertensianae* be managed as a survey strategy 4 species in Washington only.

Survey Prior to Ground-Disturbing Activities

Instruction Memorandum OR 97-007 provided clarification on Management Actions/Direction implementation for Survey and Manage Component 2 species as shown on page 10 and 33 of the Coos Bay ROD. The Instruction Memorandum provides clarification for the terms “ground disturbing activities, when a project is implemented, and implemented in 1997 or later”.

Coarse Woody Debris Management

Information Bulletin OR 97-064 provided clarification on Implementation of Coarse Woody Debris Management Actions/Direction as shown on page 22, 28, and 53 of the Coos Bay ROD. The Information Bulletin provided options and clarification for the following CWD features:

- Retention of existing CWD;
- Crediting linear feet of logs;
- Crediting of large diameter short pieces using a cubic foot equivalency alternative;
- Standing tree CWD retention versus felling to provide CWD substrate, and;
- Application of the basic guideline in areas of partial harvest.

Red Tree Vole

Instruction Memorandum OR 97-009 provided Interim Guidance and Survey Protocol for the Red Tree Vole a Survey and Manage Component 2 species, in November 1996. (*Note: this protocol has been superceded by Instruction Memorandum OR 2000-37.*)

Understory and forest gap herbivores

Information Bulletin OR 97-045 corrected a typographical error occurring on Table C-3 in the NFP and Appendix Table C-1 of the Coos Bay ROD. Under the heading of Arthropods, Understory and forest gap herbivores is changed to Understory and forest gap herbivores (South Range).

Management Recommendations were provided in January 1997 for 18 Bryophyte species.

Management Recommendations were provided in September 1997 for 29 groups of Survey and Manage Fungi species.

Survey and Manage Species Management

Survey and Manage Survey Protocols - Mollusks were provided in August 1998 as Instruction

Memorandum No. OR-98-097.

15 Percent Analysis

Joint BLM/FS final guidance, which incorporated the federal executives' agreement, was issued on September 14, 1998, as BLM - Instruction Memorandum No. OR-98-100. It emphasizes terminology and intent related to the Standards and Guidelines (S&G), provides methods for completing the assessment for each fifth field watershed, dictates certain minimum documentation requirements and establishes effective dates for implementation.

Conversion to Cubic Measurement System

Beginning in FY 98 (October 1998) all timber sales will be measured and sold based on cubic measurement rules. All timber sales will be sold based upon volume of hundred cubic feet (CCF). The Coos Bay District RMP ROD declared an allowable harvest level of 5.3 million cubic feet. Information for changes in units of measure are contained in Instruction Memorandum No. OR - 97-045.

Land Acquisition and Disposal

The following acquisition and disposal actions have occurred on the District since the RMP ROD was published.

1994

Acquired via purchase approximately 111 acres adjacent to the New River ACEC in Curry County. The lands acquired by purchase will be managed as part of the New River ACEC with a Land Use Allocation (LUA) of District Defined Reserve.

Acquired via purchase approximately 127 acres archaeological site in Douglas County. The lands acquired by purchase will be managed as an archaeological site with a LUA of District Defined Reserve.

1995

Acquired via purchase approximately 50 acres adjacent to the New River ACEC in Coos County.

Acquired via purchase approximately 54 acres adjacent to the New River ACEC in Curry County. The lands acquired by purchase will be managed as part of the New River ACEC with a LUA of District Defined Reserve.

Acquired Edson Park via donation, approximately 44 acres in Curry County. These lands will be managed as a recreation site, with a LUA of District Defined Reserve.

Acquired 160 acres adjacent to the North Fork Hunter Creek ACEC, disposed of 40 acres of

Matrix lands in an exchange (a net increase of 120 acres) in Curry County. The lands acquired in this exchange will be managed as part of the ACEC with a LUA of District Defined Reserve.

Acquired approximately 56 acres adjacent to the Dean Creek Elk Viewing Area (Spruce Reach Island) as a portion of an exchange originating on the Roseburg District. The lands acquired will be managed as part of the Elk Viewing Area with a LUA of District Defined Reserve.

1996

Public Law 104-333 transferred jurisdiction from the BLM of *Squaw Island, Zwagg Island, North Sisters Rock and...All federally-owned named, unnamed, surveyed and unsurveyed rocks, reefs, islets and islands lying within three geographic miles off the coast of Oregon and above mean high tide except Chiefs Islands... are designated as wilderness and shall become part of the Oregon Islands Wilderness under the jurisdiction of the US Fish and Wildlife Service.* This involves approximately 11 acres of PD land located in Coos and Curry Counties. These lands were included in the District Defined Reserve land use allocation.

1997

Acquired approximately 76 acres adjacent to the North Spit ACEC, disposed of approximately 320 acres (part of the effluent lagoon on the North Spit) in an exchange (a net decrease of 244 acres) in Coos County. The lands acquired will be managed as part of the North Spit ACEC with a LUA of District Defined Reserve.

1998

Acquired via purchase approximately 71 acres adjacent to the New River ACEC in Coos County. The lands acquired by purchase will be managed as part of the New River ACEC with a LUA of District Defined Reserve.

Disposed of approximately 5,410 acres of Matrix LUA lands in a jurisdictional transfer to the BIA as the "Coquille Forest" in Coos County.

1999

The District disposed of approximately 2 acres of PD land located in Coos County by direct sale to Bally Bandon. These lands were included in the Matrix land use allocation.

Survey and Manage Species Management

Survey and Manage Survey Protocols - Lynx was provided in January 1999 as Instruction Memorandum No. OR-99-25.

Survey and Manage Survey Protocols - for fifteen Vascular Plant species was provided in January 1999 as Instruction Memorandum No. OR-99-26.

Survey and Manage Management Recommendations - for fifteen Vascular Plant species was provided in January 1999 as Instruction Memorandum No. OR-99-27.

Survey and Manage Management Recommendations - for nineteen aquatic mollusk species was provided in March 1999 as Instruction Memorandum No. OR-99-38.

Survey and Manage Management Recommendations - for five bryophyte species was provided in March 1999 as Instruction Memorandum No. OR-99-39.

Correction of minor typographical error

Page 44 of the RMP/ROD incorrectly stated that none of the Rural Interface Areas were located in the Matrix. This sentence is revised to read: “The majority of the Rural Interface acres are included in the Matrix.”

Clarification of Administrative Actions That Are in Conformance with the RMP, Road Maintenance and Tree Falling for Timber Cruises

Administrative actions that are in conformance with the RMP are discussed in the Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP) for the Coos Bay District (page 4). Administrative actions are the day-to-day transactions that provide optimum use of the resources. Various administrative actions that are in conformance with the plan are specifically listed in the discussion, however, the list was not intended to be inclusive of all such actions (“These actions are in conformance with the plan. They include but are not limited to. . .” “These and other administrative actions will be conducted...”).

The ROD/RMP and BLM planning regulations provide that potential minor changes, refinements or clarifications may take the form of plan maintenance actions (ROD/RMP pg 77, 43 CFR 1610.5-4). Maintenance actions are not considered a plan amendment. It is necessary to clarify the status of the day-to-day actions of road maintenance and tree falling for timber cruises.

Road Maintenance

This plan maintenance clarifies the relationship of routine road maintenance to the RMP. Under the RMP, routine road maintenance is considered an administrative action which is in conformance with the RMP. Routine road maintenance is performed day to day and provides for the optimum use and protection of the transportation system and natural resources.

The Coos Bay District road inventory includes approximately 1,800 miles of roads. Routine

forest management activity includes maintenance of forest roads. While certain routine road maintenance is scheduled, other routine road maintenance is in response to specific needs that are identified by District personnel or the location of timber hauling activity for a given year. Although year to year levels of road maintenance vary, the District has maintained an average of 500 miles of road per year (Coos Bay District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement, page 3-8). This rate of maintenance provides that most District roads are maintained approximately every three years, although some roads may be maintained more frequently, or even on an annual basis. Road maintenance includes activities such as grading road surfaces, cleaning road ditches, cleaning culvert catch basins, minor culvert replacement, mulching and seeding of exposed slopes, clearing of fallen trees, removal of hazard trees, brushing for sight clearance, etc. Road maintenance may also include the correction of routine storm damage. Heavy storm damage to roads that require engineering and environmental design or analysis would not be considered routine road maintenance and would not be conducted as an administrative action. This clarification of the RMP does not result in the expansion of the scope of resource uses or restrictions or change the terms, conditions and decisions of the approved RMP.

Tree Falling for Timber Cruises

This plan maintenance clarifies the relationship of tree falling for timber cruises to the RMP. Under the RMP, tree falling for timber cruises is considered an administrative action which is in conformance with the RMP. Tree falling is performed on a regular basis and provides for the optimum use and protection of the forest resource.

The Coos Bay District cruises forest stands to evaluate the timber available for proposed projects, including timber sales and land exchanges. Cruising involves indirect measurement of the standing timber volume and condition by non-destructive sampling of the stand. In conjunction with the cruise, a sub-set of this sample of trees may need to be felled to directly measure the timber volume and condition. This direct measurement is used to ensure the accuracy of the indirect measure of timber volume and condition. For many projects, “3-P” sampling may be used, in which the probability of selecting any tree in the stand is proportional to a predicted volume of timber (“probability is proportional to prediction” or “3-P”). For some projects, especially silvicultural thinning in relatively homogeneous stands, trees may be felled to construct a volume table in which the timber volume of sample trees is related to the tree diameter.

The number of trees felled is dependent on site and stand conditions, especially the amount of defect in the timber. In relatively homogeneous stands of young timber with little defect, few if

any trees are needed to be felled. In large and heterogeneous stands, especially those with much timber defect, more trees may need to be felled in the project area. Trees felled are scattered widely and randomly over the project area, generally at a density of one tree per acre. Tree falling for timber cruises involves less than one percent of the trees in a stand. Felled trees are cut into lengths for direct measurement of volume and direct evaluation of timber condition. The removal or retention of the felled trees is addressed in a project specific environmental assessment. Tree falling for timber cruises does not take place in late-successional reserves. This clarification of the RMP does not result in the expansion of the scope of resource uses or restrictions or change the terms, conditions and decisions of the approved RMP.

Marbled Murrelet Surveys

This plan maintenance clarifies the situations where conducting two years of survey prior to any human disturbance of marbled murrelet habitat may not be practical. In situations where only scattered, individual trees are affected, such as fisheries tree lining projects, hiring trained climbers to climb individual trees to look for murrelet nests can meet the intent of assuring marbled murrelet nesting habitat is not harmed. In some situations, climbers can detect murrelet nests several years after the nest has been used. With projects like tree lining where the impact is at the tree level and not the stand level, climbing actually gives better results for ascertaining the impact of the project to murrelets.

For the Coos Bay District this clarification can be accomplished by revising the language on page 36 as follows: Conduct surveys to accepted protocol standards prior to any human disturbance of marbled murrelet habitat. This revised language will provide more flexibility in conducting the required murrelet surveys, but will not result in the expansion of the scope of resource uses or restrictions or change the terms, conditions and decisions of the approved RMP.

FY 2000 Plan Maintenance Items

Existing Roads Within Key Watersheds

Numerous interdisciplinary teams have struggled with how to define the existing baseline for roads within Key Watersheds. Guidance on how to define the baseline roads or the discretionary ability to close roads was not included in the RMP Management Action/Direction for Key Watersheds. Information Bulletin OR-2000-134 issued on March 13, 2000, clarified what roads shall be included in the 1994 BLM road inventory base used as a starting point to monitor the “reduction of road mileage within Key Watersheds” as follows:

Any road in existence on BLM administered land as of April 1994, regardless of ownership or whether it was in the road records, shall be included in the 1994 base road inventory. Also, include BLM-controlled roads on non-BLM administered lands. A BLM controlled road is one where the BLM has the authority to modify or close the road. Do not include skid roads/trails, as technically they are not roads.

For the Coos Bay District, this clarification can be accomplished by adding the language as stated above to page 7 of the RMP/ROD.

Change in Survey Schedule for Seven Survey and Manage Fungi

On April 4, 2000 the BLM State Director issued a decision in Instruction Memorandum No. OR-

2000-49, to ... “further delay the effective date by which surveying would be necessary for 7 “survey and manage” and protection buffer fungi species, until such time as either (1) the decision is made to eliminate or modify survey requirements for these species pursuant to a proposal now being analyzed in a supplemental environmental impact statement, or (2) the level of disturbance, as described in the October 1998 Environmental Analysis, is reached. This decision is needed because surveys for these 7 species continue to be infeasible.”

This Plan Maintenance adopts that decision and documentation for application on the Coos Bay district.

Survey and Manage Species Management

The following Survey Protocol or Management Recommendations were transmitted via Instruction Memorandum or Information Bulletin in FY 2000:

- Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2000-003 dated October 1999 transmitted Management Recommendations for 23 Terrestrial Mollusks.
- Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2000-004 dated October 1999 transmitted survey protocol for five amphibians.
- Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2000-015 dated November 1999 transmitted Management Recommendations for four Terrestrial Mollusks.
- Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2000-017 dated December 1999 and June 2000 transmitted survey protocol and corrections for six bryophyte species.
- Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2000-018 dated December 1999 transmitted survey protocol for seven fungi.
- Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2000-037 dated February 2000 transmitted survey protocol for the red tree vole.
- Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2000-042 dated March 2000 transmitted Management Recommendations for 29 lichens.
- Information Bulletin No. OR-2000-315 dated August 2000 transmitted revised survey protocol for the Marbled Murrelet.
- Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2000-086 dated September 2000 transmitted Management Recommendations for the red tree vole.

Land Acquisition and Disposal

The following disposal actions have occurred on the District in FY 2000.

The District disposed of approximately 1 acre of CBWR land located in Coos County by direct sale to Enos Ralph. These lands were included in the Matrix land use allocation.

The District disposed of approximately 2 acres of CBWR land located in Coos County by direct sale to Leslie Crum. These lands were included in the Matrix (Connectivity/Diversity Block) land use allocation.

A Solicitor's Opinion was issued in FY 2000, which resolved title of the Coos Bay Wagon Road. Where the road crosses public land, a 100 foot strip belongs in fee title to the county. In the Coos Bay District, the ownership is Coos County; the portion in Douglas County which is in the Roseburg District, belongs to Douglas County. Approximately 15 miles of road crosses CBWR and O&C land in Coos Bay District. As a result of this opinion, the Matrix is reduced by approximately 137 acres and the LSR is reduced by approximately 55 acres.

Redesignation of Land Status

Public Law 101-42, as amended required in part, *...the Secretary shall redesignate, from public domain lands within the tribe's service area, as defined in this Act, certain lands to be subject to the O & C Act. Lands redesignated under this subparagraph shall not exceed lands sufficient to constitute equivalent timber value as compared to lands constituting the Coquille Forest.* The District has identified approximately 8,182 acres of PD which would be redesignated as CBWR or O&C to have "equivalent timber value" to the approximate 4,800 acres of CBWR and O&C within the Coquille Forest. The redesignation is as follows:

Approximately 2,730 acres redesignated from PD to CBWR located in Coos County.

Approximately 154 acres redesignated from PD to O&C located in Lane County.

Approximately 2,117 acres redesignated from PD to O&C located in Douglas County.

Approximately 3,179 acres redesignated from PD to O&C located in Curry County.

The notice redesignating the identified PD lands was published in the *Federal Register*, Vol. 65, No. 96 on May 17, 2000 with an effective date of July 16, 2000.

Note: The complete legal descriptions of the lands involved are available from the office.

As a result of these land actions, Table 1 published in the Coos Bay RMP ROD is hereby updated as shown in Table 30.

County	O&C	CBWR	PD	Acquired	Other	Total Surface ¹	Reserved Minerals
Coos	93,943	60,447	6,151	370	0	160,911	7,828
Curry	3,258	0	28,762	270	0	32,290	2,589
Douglas	123,558	636	6,369	133	0	130,696	1,735
Lane	154	0	401	0	0	555	0
Totals	220,913	61,083	41,683	773	0	324,452	12,152

¹ Acres based on the master title plat and titles for land acquisitions and disposals. Reflects changes in ownership and land status from March 1993 to September 2000. Acres are not the same as shown in the GIS.

No Net Loss

Public Law 105-321 established a policy of “No Net Loss” of O&C and Coos Bay Wagon Road (CBWR) lands in western Oregon. The Act requires that, *when selling, purchasing, or exchanging land, BLM may neither 1) reduce the total acres of O&C or CBWR lands nor 2) reduce the number of acres of O&C or CBWR lands that are available for timber harvest below what existed on October 30, 1998.*

Table 27 on page 73 displays the results for the first three years of the No Net Loss policy on the District.

Third Year Evaluation

The Coos Bay District Resource Management Plan (RMP) stated that the RMP would be evaluated at the end of every third year after implementation began, to determine whether there is sufficient cause to warrant amendment or revision of the plans. The Third Year Plan Evaluation will be available early in FY 2001. The Plan Evaluation addresses implementation of the Coos Bay District RMP through Fiscal Year (FY) 1998. The document provides a brief background and explanation of the plan evaluation process and the State Director’s plan evaluation findings.

The Coos Bay District RMP was evaluated concurrently with five other western Oregon RMPs. The process involved extensive and complex cross district discussions, analysis and coordination. Although the majority of the evaluation process took place during FY 1999, completion of the plan evaluation was delayed due to the involvement of key staff on critical issues relevant to the Coos Bay District RMP and the Northwest Forest Plan. These issues included the Survey and Manage supplemental environmental impact statement and litigation pertaining to the Northwest Forest Plan.

The State Director's plan evaluation findings are based on a wide variety of information. The data, information, analysis, and staff recommendations for this evaluation are contained in the Supporting Document which will be available on the internet at <http://www.or.blm.gov>. Both the staff recommendations and the State Director's findings reflect information and circumstances relevant to the evaluation period, which ended September 1998. Since the end of the evaluation period, issues and circumstances have continued to evolve and affect RMP implementation. The ability to fully implement programs including restoration activities, recreation, and particularly the allowable sale quantity, has been affected by work related to the Survey and Manage standard and guidelines and litigation. These evolving circumstances will be addressed in subsequent plan evaluations.

Survey and Manage EIS

On January 17, 2001, the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and US Fish and Wildlife Service announced the signing of a Record of Decision by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to amend the "Survey and Manage" provisions in the Northwest Forest Plan. These amendments were made through a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for Amendment to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standard and Guidelines.

This decision clarifies Survey and Manage language by eliminating inconsistent or redundant direction; better identifies species needs, based on updated information; and establishes a process for adding or removing species when new information becomes available. It incorporates the most up-to-date science, better protects rare and little known species, and uses the agencies' limited resources more efficiently.

The Northwest Forest Plan required land managers to follow Survey and Manage Standards and Guidelines to provide benefits to some 400 species of amphibians, bryophytes, lichens, mollusks, vascular plants, and fungi. The agency scientists have discovered that it is not possible to identify some species in the field or locate some species within one or two years of conducting surveys. In addition, there were no criteria for changing categories, adding, or removing species from the Survey and Manage list. This resulted in both management activities that are more restrictive than necessary to meet species persistence objectives and some species did not receive adequate protection. In 1998 the agencies began the preparation of a SEIS to correct the identified problems. Also, in 1998 the agencies were sued over implementation of the Survey and Manage guidelines (ONRC Action v. USFS, Civ. #C98-0359D). The District Court of Washington ruled against the agencies and a "settlement agreement" was negotiated with the plaintiffs which allowed the agencies to continue their program of work. The settlement agreement is very costly to implement and the surveys for some species under this agreement do not provide either credible protection for the species or credible scientific information for species management.

The Record of Decision amended the Coos Bay District Resource Management Plan and will:

- Focus agency budget and personnel on those species, habitats, and proposed activities where

management is needed most.

- Continue to meet the species management objectives of the Northwest Forest Plan.
- Maintain the balance struck in the Northwest Forest Plan between risk to species and commodity production.
- End the procedures required under the settlement agreement (ONRC Action v. USFS, Civ. #C98-0359D).
- Removes 72 species from Survey and Manage in all (63 species) or part (9 species) of their range. Included are 18 fungi, 35 lichen, 11 bryophytes, 2 mollusks, and 6 vascular plants.
- Under the Record of Decision, 346 species that remain on the Survey and Manage list are placed in one of six categories based on knowledge and concerns about the species, and characteristics affecting practicality of conducting surveys prior to habitat-disturbing activities.
- Known sites will be managed for 327 of the species. Surveys will be done prior to habitat disturbance for 75 species. All 346 species will receive strategic surveys.

For additional information see: www.or.blm.gov/nwfpnepa.